

2026:PHHC:002980



**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**

210

CRM-M-72503-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 13.01.2026

Navpreet Singh Sadiura @ Navpreet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Karandeep Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (*for short 'BNSS'*), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 60 dated 28.03.2025, registered under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Sadar Ludhiana, District Ludhiana.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a written complaint submitted by complainant Abdul Majid, who was running an institute for preparation of IELTS examination under the name of English Helpline at Malerkotla, alleging therein that on asking of his friend Mohmud Khalid, who was interested to travel to United Kingdom along with his family on work permit visa, he had contacted accused Megha Sood and the present petitioner, who were running an immigration consultancy business under the

2026:PHHC:002980



name of Homeland Immigration at Jagraon. Both of them had represented themselves as experienced immigration facilitators, who had successfully sent several persons abroad. They had assured the complainant to procure work permit visas of United Kingdom for Mahmud Khalid and his family members and demanded a sum of Rs.30.10 Lakhs for the said purpose. The negotiations were finalized at Rs. 29.50 Lakhs. The petitioner had demanded an advance amount of Rs. 4 Lakhs from Mahmud Khalid, which was given to him along with certain documents. The petitioner and co-accused Megha Sood induced the complainant and his friend Mahmud Khalid to part with an amount of Rs.30.50 Lakhs on the premise of sending Mahmud Khalid and his family members abroad. However, subsequently, it was revealed that the petitioner and co-accused did not have any valid license to run immigration consultancy business and had forged license number/certificate of sponsorship number, which was given by them to the complainant. An amount of Rs. 13.50 Lakhs had been given to the petitioner in cash. When the complainant demanded the same back, the petitioner issued two cheques, which was dishonoured. The petitioner also executed a written compromise admitting that he had received an amount of Rs.13.50 Lakhs from the complainant for sending abovementioned persons abroad. An inquiry was conducted into the matter and above named Megha Sood was found to be innocent. Offences under Sections 465, 467, 468, 471 read with Section 120-B of IPC were deleted qua co-accused Megha Sood and Renu Sood. Investigation is underway. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail, which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, vide order dated 15.09.2025.

2026:PHHC:002980



3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. There is delay of more than seven months in lodging of the FIR. No money had been transferred in the bank account of the petitioner nor any certificate of sponsorship had been sent to the complainant or Nida Sadiqi. The petitioner had given two cheques as security for the amount which was transferred in the account of co-accused Megha Sood, who was engaged with the petitioner but the same had been dishonoured due to insufficiency of funds. Co-accused Megha Sood has transferred an amount of Rs. 2.50 Lakhs in the account of the brother of the complainant. No money is payable by the petitioner. He is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner deserves to be granted concession of anticipatory bail.

4. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner, who was running an immigration consultancy business in the name of Homeland Immigration, who along with co-accused had represented himself as an immigration facilitator. An amount of Rs.25.50 Lakhs was taken by him from the complainant and his friend Mahmud Khalid on the premise of sending the latter and his family abroad with a dishonest intention. Upon failure to procure the promised visas for United Kingdom, two cheques had been issued by the petitioner, which were dishonoured. He himself had admitted receipt of an amount of Rs.13.50 Lakhs in cash. For conducting thorough investigation in the matter, his custodial interrogation is must. It is, thus, argued that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

2026:PHHC:002980



5. This Court has heard the rival submissions.
6. The petitioner in connivance with co-accused Megha Sood (who is stated to have been found innocent subsequently) is alleged to have duped the complainant and his friend Mahmud Khalid of an amount of Rs.25.50 Lakhs on the premise of sending the latter and his family members abroad. Co-accused had returned some money to the victims. However, the cheques issued by the petitioner have been dishonoured. The allegations prima facie make out a case for commission of offence of cheating on the part of the petitioner. His custodial interrogation is required for conducting thorough and proper investigation in the matter. In case his custodial interrogation is denied to the investigating agency, the same will leave many glaring loopholes and gaps adversely affecting the investigation. The powers under Section 482 of BNSS are extraordinary and the same are to be exercised sparingly in exceptional circumstances. The judicial discretion conferred upon the Court has to be properly exercised after application of mind as to the nature and gravity of the accusation, possibility of applicant fleeing from justice and other factors to decide whether it is a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail as such grant to some extent interferes in the sphere of investigation of an offence. The Court has also to see that an order of anticipatory bail should not operate as inroad in the normal legal procedure of criminal cases by the trial Court. The custodial interrogation of a suspected person is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favourable order under Section 482 of BNSS. The Court must be circumspect while exercising such power for grant of anticipatory bail and it should not be granted as a matter of rule and has to be granted only when the Court is convinced that

2026:PHHC:002980



exceptional circumstances exist to resort to that extra ordinary remedy. In the present case, no such exceptional circumstances warranting exercise of the powers for grant of anticipatory bail by this Court are existing. As such, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

7. It is made clear that the observations made hereinabove are only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

13.01.2026

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No